tabled this motion for discussion is to remind the Government of their duty to satisfy the public in such a matter of vital importance as this.

May I know the parties to the suit?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran *(Government Advocate and Law Officer).*—The Police Officer concerned has filed a complaint against the party who made the allegation, viz., Mr. Namboodiri and another gentleman who repeated that allegation.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Urakam).* — Who is that gentleman?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran *(Government Advocate and Law Officer).*—It is Mr. C. R. Iyyunni.

Mr. K. M. Ibrahim *(Cranganur).*—The Government said that they were satisfied .....

Mr. President.—I cannot allow a discussion on that. As the matter is sub-judice we will err on the side of rigidity.

Mr. K. M. Ibrahim (*Cranganur*).—Sir, this is a veritable stifling of discussion.

Motions were ruled out of order.

iv & v re: the delay in publishing and proceeding with the Municipal Bill.

Mr. President.—The next two motions are tabled by Mr. Ikkanda Warriar and they are to discuss the delay on the part of the Government in passing the Municipal Bill. How are you justified in accusing the Government of delay?

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Urakam).*—Sir, the life of the Municipal Councils has once been extended by one year. It will expire on the first of Vrischigom next. As matters stand this is the last meeting of the legislative session of this year. According to the rules the next meeting will be in Vrischigom next. So in the ordinary course of things there seems to be no chance of the Municipal Bill being passed this year. I signed the Select Committee report on the 14th or 15th of Kumbham. To-day is the 18th Meenom. According to me the Government had sufficient time to include this Bill in the agenda and if they had done so we would have carried through the measure and obviated the necessity for the Government to extend the life of the present Council again which will be a very serious infringement upon the rights of the people.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

* **Mr. Thomas Manjuran** *(Government Advocate and Law Officer).*—Sir, the Committee appointed by this Council to consider the Municipal Bill expedited the matter, as the Hon'ble Member himself knows, as much as possible even by continuous sitting from day to day and on account of the sheer size of the measure and the numerous amendments that were moved by the several Hon'ble Members including the Hon'ble Member for Urakam himself, and on account of the heavy nature of the work, the report was finally prepared on the 14th of Kumbhom. As soon as the report was finally prepared it was submitted to the Government and the Government had to consider the innumerable amendments passed by the Select Committee—amendments of great consequence involving in some cases the fundamental principles of the Bill. Naturally the Government wanted to study them and to evaluate the Bill again in the light of the amendments. This is a matter which obviously would take time. After all to-day we are on the 18th Meenom. It is only one month and four days. Out of this one month and four days some two weeks would be taken up for scrutinising the amendments. The rest of the time will necessarily be taken up by getting the amendments published and including it in the agenda. Government cannot obviously do this work within one month and four days. Government have absolutely no idea of holding up the Bill. So it is clear that as much expedition as possible has been shown in the matter. Government's limitations are obvious. In a matter like this the Government cannot do anything hastily.

The further question is, even supposing all this to be true whether this motion is allowable under the rules. I submit it is not. Here is a motion relating to a measure that is now actually pending before the House. What are the matters contemplated by the rules. Rules 18 and 19 say:—"A motion for an adjournment of the business of the Council for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance may be made with the consent of the President. The right to move the adjournment of the Council for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance shall be subject to the following restrictions, viz.,

(1) Not more than one such motion shall be made at the same sitting;

(2) Not more than one matter can be discussed on the same motion, and motion must be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence;

(3) The motion must not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session;

* Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(4) The motion must not anticipate a matter which has been previously appointed for consideration or with reference to which a notice of motion has been previously given.

(5) The motion must not deal with a matter on which a resolution could not be moved."

Now we have to consider what exactly is the scope of the words, *'of recent occurrence'*. It cannot obviously relate to a matter pending consideration of this Council. The Council entrusted the Bill to a Committee and the Committee has submitted its report and the matter is pending with the Government. Therefore I submit that in any case whether on the question of merits or on the scope of the rules the motion is not in order.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Urakam)*.—Sir, we are not on the merits of the question whether the Government had sufficient justification or not for not bringing before this Council the Bill in question. But we are at this stage concerned only on the question whether the motion is in order and the only relevant point raised by the Hon'ble the Law Member is that it is not a matter of recent occurrence. My submission is that it is a matter of recent occurrence, the omission or the laches, as I have called it in my motion, by the Government to include it in this Session's Agenda, took place only very recently. It could take place only after the submission of the Select Committee Report on the 14 of Kumbhom as admitted by the Hon'ble Member. It is a matter that occurred after that date. I therefore submit that the motion is entirely in order.

Mr. President.—It is not necessary nor is it possible to consider the merits of this question, whether the Government had committed laches or not, to appreciate the motion before the House. What the Chair is concerned is whether the question of the failure of Government to put down on the Agenda this particular measure is of sufficient public importance and of recent occurrence to warrant an adjournment motion. Personally I am inclined to hold that such a motion will not be within the Standing Orders and Rules of the Council. But I am prepared to give the benefit of doubt to the Mover of the motion. Since objection has been taken by the Government I would request Hon'ble Members who will support the motion to kindly stand up in their places.

(More than 20 Members stood up).

The Hon'ble Member has got the leave of the House to move the motion. The motion will be taken up at half past three of the clock.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly